

# Annual Plan 2023 - 2024

## Submissions Thematic Analysis

Prepared by Monitoring & Research

May 2023

## How to use this document

The purpose of this document is not to provide analysis on everything that submitters commented on, but rather to provide a summary of key topics and issues identified by submitters.

The analysis is based on the opinions of submitters, whether they are factually correct or not.

The first part of this report provides an overview of the key themes and messages that have come through in submissions, and the latter provides detailed submissions analysis for some of the topics and issues that were most popular with submitters.

Note: The number of submitters provided in brackets next to each category heading are indicative of the number of submitters who commented on each theme/category. Where we have asked specific multiple-choice questions, the figures have been provided in the associated tables within each category.

## Key Messages

The financial pressures that households are facing were front of mind for many submitters this year. Submitters commonly acknowledged the significant work that had gone in to keeping the proposed rates increase low and appreciated that the financial pressure on households had been considered as the annual plan was being formulated.

On the other hand, a large cohort of submitters expressed apprehension that such a conservative increase may compromise the long-term progress of the city. These submitters tended to be concerned about the growing impacts of our changing climate and urged us to allocate greater resources towards initiatives aimed at reducing emissions and minimizing the effects of climate change.

Threads of concern about climate change and reducing our emissions ran through many submissions this year, with submitters urging us to take climate change seriously and do more to support emissions reduction and ensure we meet our climate goals. While this was particularly prominent in submission points on transport, it was also evident through many other categories and topics.

Transport remained a significant focus for submitters, with hundreds of submitters addressing a range of transport issues. Over recent years, we have seen a shift in the nature of the submissions on transport issues. This year we have seen the primary issues covered by submitters shift away from the maintenance and quality of our transport infrastructure, with instead a strong emphasis on prioritising investment in public transport infrastructure, footpaths, streetscapes, and cycleways, and the future of our transport network coming to the fore.

Many submitters highlighted the importance of investing in active and public transport, with many indicating they would support more investment in footpaths, cycleways and public transport infrastructure. While some were happy with our proposed spend in these areas, many indicated that they would like to see us spending more. These submitters regularly noted that transport is a significant source of emissions in Christchurch, and urged us to invest more in activities, programmes and projects that will contribute to emissions reduction.

Safety was a focus of many submissions addressing transport issues, with calls for us to do more to make it safer to travel in Christchurch. Safety was a theme across all transport categories, however it was particularly prominent in relation to investing in cycling infrastructure. Submitters highlighted the importance of providing safe cycling infrastructure across the city and called for us to get on and deliver the promised major cycleways network.

Residents of the east continue to express their frustration with what they see as a lack of progress in their neighbourhoods. Many submitters advocated for work planned in these areas to be completed earlier than currently programmed.

Other submitters from a range of areas across the city highlighted the ongoing impacts that regular surface flooding is having on their quality of life, urging us to do something to resolve these ongoing issues.

We were again reminded of the value that our community facilities provide for residents and communities by several submitters. Once more, our residents have told us that we should not undervalue the service or sense of community that our community facilities provide and foster.

This was highlighted by submitters addressing the rebuild/repair of the South Library and additional canoe polo courts at Lake Roto Kohatu in particular.

Submitters highlighted the importance of the South Library for communities in the south of the city, with a clear message that the community expect a fit for purpose facility to be delivered out of the repair/rebuild process. Submitters expressed a significant level of concern about a reduced budget or scope for the facilities.

Submitters addressing the need for additional canoe polo courts at Lake Roto Kohatu highlighted the importance of providing facilities that offer young people in our city a range of opportunities to be active and participate in the sports and activities that they enjoy.

Once again, the desire to take a partnership approach on projects was a key theme among many submissions. We have a range of communities and community groups and organisations who care deeply and want to work with us on achieving good outcomes for their communities and/or projects.

Submitters also suggested that we should explore more partnership opportunities, particularly in the context of disposing of council owned land. Many submitters suggested alternative uses for the land which would involve us partnering with communities, groups or organisations to achieve outcomes that would have wider benefit for our communities and residents.

Numerous submitters talked of a need to reduce wasteful spending and focus on core services or the basics, however there was little consensus on what is a core service or what the basics look like, and the reality is, these are likely to differ from resident to resident - one person's 'nice to have' is another person's core service.

There were several topics and issues where the preferences or opinions of submitters were divided. The proposed increase to the daily residential water allowance and the wheels to wings cycleway are just two of many examples. In some instances, submitters talked about finding the right balance on an issue, which serves as a good reminder of the need bring together and balance the varying views, opinions and preferences of our residents and communities when making decisions.

## Who did we hear from?

\*Not stated includes submitters who did not provide a postal address, those who provided only a street name or suburb, and any submitters who used a PO Box address

Community Board	Number of Submitters	%* of Submitters
Not Stated*	240	29%
Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula	31	4%
Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood	66	8%
Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton	70	9%
Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood	108	13%
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central	119	15%
Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote	182	22%
Total	816	100%

Ward	Number of Submitters	%* of Submitters
Not Stated	240	29%
Banks Peninsula	31	4%
Burwood	18	2%
Cashmere	79	10%
Central	48	6%
Coastal	30	4%
Fendalton	31	4%
Halswell	30	4%
Harewood	47	6%
Heathcote	60	7%
Hornby	17	2%
Innes	16	2%
Linwood	18	2%
Papanui	55	7%
Riccarton	23	3%
Spreydon	43	5%
Waimairi	30	4%

## Who did we hear from?

### Number of Submitters by Age

Age	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	216	26%
Under 18 years	9	1%
18 – 24 years	34	4%
25 – 34 years	85	10%
35 – 49 years	151	18%
50 – 64 years	169	21%
65 years and over	154	19%

### Number of Submitters by Gender

Gender	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	253	31%
Male	290	35%
Female	268	33%
Gender Diverse	7	0.1%

### Number of Submitters by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
NZ European	511	62%
Māori	25	3%
Pacific Peoples	4	0.5%
Asian	18	2%
Middle Eastern, Latin American & African	7	1%
Other European	48	6%
Other	43	5%

## Why do we collect demographic information?

It is important that we understand both who we have and have not heard from when we consult on issues that affect everyone in the city. We include a standard set of demographic questions across our consultations that help us better understand this. These questions are optional; submitters do not have to answer them to make a submission.

Where possible, we align the questions we ask with the information that StatsNZ collects via the census. This ensures that we are capturing the information that is consistent with the national approach to reporting on demographics, but also enables us to benchmark and understand whether we have heard from a representative group of submitters.

## Rates

### Residential Rates (374 submitters)

While there was mixed feedback on the overall quantum of the rates increase, a large number of submitters indicated that they appreciated the effort to keep rates increases as low as possible at a time when households are under an increasing amount of financial pressure.

The majority (n=157) of submitters who provided feedback on the rates proposal were supportive of the proposed increase in the draft plan, while 75 submitters opposed this proposal and 75 provided alternative proposals.

Many of those who supported the proposed increase noted that it was below inflation, and highlighted their appreciation of the work that had been done to be able to deliver a proposed increase that was below inflation. Others indicated that they would rather a small increase than to see the city go backwards or to see projects or services that are important to them impacted by significant cost cutting to keep rates down. There was an acknowledgement from some that much like households, our costs were also increasing, and some level of rates increase was needed to account for this.

Other submitters expressed frustration with ongoing rates increases of any level, suggesting that we need to cut our cloth to fit within our means, just like households must. Many expressed concerns about their ongoing ability to afford yearly rates increases, particularly when households are facing increasing financial pressures from a number of fronts. Many suggested that rates increases would not be necessary if we reduced unnecessary spending and focused on core services. While it was unclear what core services meant to each submitter, spending on social and cultural initiatives and staff salaries were highlighted by submitters as areas where cuts could be made.

Around 30 submitters indicated that they thought the proposed increase should be higher. These submitters tended to feel that we were putting progress on important issues, programmes, and projects in jeopardy by focusing on keeping rates as low as possible. These submitters tended to indicate that they would rather see a larger rates increase that ensured continued investment and progress on projects that contribute to the city's liveability, with a particular focus on those that will improve environmental sustainability.

General comments on rates tended to highlight concerns about the ongoing affordability of rates, particularly for low-income households. The need for council to strike the right balance between keeping rates down but keeping the city moving forward was stressed by many. Some indicated that they would be happy with the proposed increase so long as spending on issues that they see as important is prioritised, while others emphasised that they feel we need to continue to reduce unnecessary spending.

Age had some bearing on support of the rates proposal. Those aged 24 years and under were more likely to propose an alternative, while those aged 35 years and over were more likely to oppose the proposed increase.



### Business Differential (187 submitters)

The majority of submitters who commented on the business differential were supportive of adjusting the balance so that the business sector continues to pay the same proportion of rates as it currently does. Some noted that they don't want to see a disproportionate burden put on businesses, but support changing the differential to keep it in line with what they currently pay.

Those who opposed tended to highlight that much like households, businesses were struggling with increasing costs. There was mention that as a city we should be enabling business and doing more to support them and acknowledging the value that they bring to the city.

Business Differential	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Support scaling up the business differential, so business sector as a whole pays the same proportion of overall rates that it currently does.	289	89%
Do not support scaling up the business differential, so business sector as a whole pays the same proportion of overall rates that it currently does.	37	11%

Note: Numbers in table(s) based on responses to multiple choice questions

### Uniform Annual General Charge (270 submitters)

Feedback on the proposal to lower the uniform annual general charge to \$50 was mixed.

Of the submitters who indicated their preference in the multiple-choice question, 64% (n=219) supported retaining the UAGC at the current level of \$153 while 36% supported setting it at the lower value of \$50.

UAGC	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Our proposal (A): Our current proposed UAGC of \$153 in 2023/24. This is in line with the current proportion of your rates bill that forms the UAGC, and is in line with the overall rates increase.	219	64%
The alternative (B): Setting the UAGC at a lower value of \$50, reducing the overall rates on properties with a lower capital value, but leaving a \$17 million shortfall in the Council's rates take, which would need to be made up by other ratepayers.	122	36%

Note: Numbers in table(s) based on responses to multiple choice questions

Feedback from those who supported maintaining the UAGC at \$153 highlighted that:

- Our UAGC is already one of the lowest in country and is significantly less than some other councils' charge.
- Service delivery is not based on capital value; in some instances, it is equitable for all rate payers to contribute proportionally, regardless of their capital value, given that they are all entitled to similar levels of access and benefit from the services covered by the UAGC.

Several submitters highlighted that they feel the ones who will be hit the hardest by proposal B are the hard-working middle-income earners. This was often accompanied by feedback that these households are already struggling to keep up with the ongoing pressures they are facing. Others felt that rates relief mechanisms would be a better way to target assistance to the households that need it.

Those who supported setting the UAGC at a lower value of \$50 tended to feel that reducing the burden on low-income households and redistributing it to those with more ability to pay would be a fairer and more equitable approach. There was a sense from these submitters that we have an obligation to protect and reduce hardship on households who are more likely to be financially vulnerable and most affected by the current cost of living challenges.

Generally, submitters in the 18 – 24 years and 25 – 34 years age groups tended to be more supportive of lowering the UAGC to \$50, however the majority of 25 – 34 year olds still supported maintaining it at the proposed \$153. Those over the age of 35 years were more likely to support retaining the UAGC at \$153.

Age	Our proposal (A): \$153		The alternative (B): \$50	
	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	13	81%	3	19%
Under 18 years	2	100%		
18 – 24 years	8	44%	10	56%
25 – 34 years	34	59%	24	41%
35 – 49 years	51	65%	28	35%
50 – 64 years	50	64%	28	36%
65 – 79 years	59	68%	28	32%
Over 80 years	2	67%	1	33%
Total	219	64%	122	36%

Submitters from the Banks Peninsula, Linwood, Hornby, Riccarton, Central Spreydon and Heathcote wards tended to be more supportive of the alternative (\$50), while those in the Coastal, Burwood, Halswell, Fendalton, Waimairi, Harewood, Papanui and Cashmere wards tended to be more supportive of retaining it at \$153.

Community Board	Our proposal (A): \$153		The alternative (B): \$50	
	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated*	65	71%	26	29%
Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula	2	33%	4	67%
Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood	16	50%	16	50%
Coastal	9	56%	7	44%
Burwood	6	67%	3	33%
Linwood	1	14%	6	86%
Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton	16	67%	8	33%
Halswell	13	93%	1	7%
Hornby	1	25%	3	75%
Riccarton	2	33%	4	67%
Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood	35	70%	15	30%
Fendalton	14	78%	4	22%
Waimairi	9	56%	7	44%
Harewood	12	75%	4	25%
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central	38	72%	15	28%
Papanui	30	83%	6	17%
Innes	2	50%	2	50%
Central	6	46%	7	54%
Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote	47	55%	38	45%
Spreydon	8	42%	11	58%
Cashmere	22	81%	5	19%
Heathcote	17	44%	22	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>36%</b>

Note: Numbers in table(s) based on responses to multiple choice questions

## City Vacant Differential (97 submitters)

The majority of submitters (n= 240) supported extending the City Vacant Differential rating to the commercial areas of New Brighton, Lyttelton, Sydenham and Linwood Village. Generally, these submitters felt that in many cases the sites and owners who would be impacted by this were holding up development in many of these areas, and extending the vacant differential into these areas would encourage better use of vacant land.

These submitters emphasized that they feel it is important that landowners are motivated to either develop their land in these areas or sell it to someone who is motivated to develop it and use it productively.

Those who opposed the extension of the city vacant differential felt that the council should be supporting development, providing incentives for them to develop their land as opposed to punishing them for not doing so (i.e., the carrot vs. stick approach). These submitters warned that it may lead to Christchurch being seen as anti-development.

City Vacant Differential	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Support extending the use of City Vacant Differential rating in the commercially zoned areas of New Brighton, Lyttelton, Sydenham and Linwood Village	240	82%
Oppose extending the use of City Vacant Differential rating in the commercially zoned areas of New Brighton, Lyttelton, Sydenham and Linwood Village	53	18%

Note: Numbers in table(s) based on responses to multiple choice questions.

## Capital Endowment Fund (84 submitters)

Submitters who supported using \$1 million from the capital endowment fund recognised the importance of community organisations and the need to support them, while also acknowledging the pressure on households currently and the need to reduce the burden on them. There was general agreement from these submitters that option 1 struck the right balance.

Those who favoured option 2 expressed concerns about using funds from the capital endowment fund and were concerned that overall, it would reduce the amount of community funding available. They would prefer that less of the funds in the capital endowment fund were used to reduce rates, leaving more there for its intended purpose.

There were concerns from some submitters that this would be a move towards reducing the amount of community funding available over time, while on the other hand submitters noted that they do not see providing community grants as core council business.

Capital Endowment Fund	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Option 1: Using \$1 million from the CEF for one year only to fund grants, and reduce the overall average rates increase by 0.16%.	195	64%
Option 2: Using \$500,000 from the CEF for one year only to fund grants, and reduce the overall average rates increase by 0.08%.	110	36%

Note: Numbers in table(s) based on responses to multiple choice questions.

## Excess Water Charge

### Excess Water Charge (103 submitters)

A number of submitters provided feedback on the excess water charge. The majority of these were general comments about the charge and its use as a mechanism to reduce water use.

20 submitters indicated their support for the excess water charge, 23 opposed, 25 provided alternative proposals and 37 provided general comments or feedback.

Many of those who indicated their support for the charge highlighted the importance of water conservation and providing incentives to encourage people to be more considerate with their water use. Some submitters highlighted that the charge has already made a difference with water use decreasing over the 2022/2023 summer.

Those who opposed tended to raise concerns around the equity of the charge, with many calling for it to be removed altogether. The issues identified by submitters largely stem from the charge not taking into account the size of the property or the number of residents occupying it. Others mentioned that they believe that access to water is a basic human right and residents should have free access to as much water as they need. Submitters raised concerns about being charged for water when there are still a large number of leaks from council infrastructure that have not been addressed.

Submitters proposed a range of alternatives. In many instances suggestions were made that the charge should not be implemented until we have fixed all the leaks that we are responsible for and/or every house has its own meter, and the charge can be applied in a way that is fair and equitable. Others thought that it unfairly penalised those who keep and care for large gardens, and some concessions should be allowed for this or we risk putting our garden city identity at risk. There were suggestions from others that instead of charging an excess water rate, all water charging should just be volumetric with people paying for what they use.

The general comments and feedback echoed the key messages raised by other submitters. Many of these submitters indicated that they do not think the charge is being applied in a way that is fair and equitable. Submitters questioned how fair the charge is when it does not take into account the size of the property or the number of residents occupying it. Others raised questions about the fairness of how the charge is being applied, noting that we do not currently charge multi-unit

developments on a shared meter. The impact of different soil types across the city was raised by others.

### Daily water allowance for residential properties (233 submitters)

Submitters were divided on the proposed increase to the daily allowance of water for residential properties, with no clear preference either way.

Of the submitters who responded to the multiple-choice question on the daily limit, 50% (n=191) support increasing the allowance to 900 litres a day, while 50% (n=190) indicated that they would like the daily limit to stay at 700 litres.

Some submitters indicated a preference in their comments only. Of these submitters, 15 support increasing the daily allowance to 900 litres while 19 do not support the proposal.

Daily water allowance	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Support increasing daily allowance to 900 litres a day for residential properties	191	50%
Oppose increasing daily allowance to 900 litres a day for residential properties	190	50%

Note: Numbers in table(s) based on responses to multiple choice questions.

Those who support increasing the daily allowance expressed concerns about the equity of the 700 litre daily allowance, feeling that it compromises the ability to keep and care for gardens, places unnecessary pressure on large families, and that the 900 litre option generally strikes a better balance between the need to conserve water and ensuring that the charge is fair and equitable.

In a number of instances submitters who support the increase acknowledged the need for water conservation and to be good stewards of our water resources but were more comfortable with the 900 litre daily allowance. Other submitters indicated that they still weren't happy with the charge but thought that increasing the daily allowance to 900 litres was a step in the right direction.

Those who opposed tended to feel that 700 litres was already a generous daily allowance and those who are high users should pay their fair share for the additional pressure they are putting on the network. The importance of water conservation and protecting our water resources was regularly highlighted by these submitters, with some noting that in the context of our changing climate we need to be using water more carefully. These submitters indicated that they feel increasing the daily allowance to 900 litres will send the wrong message and could result in more careless use of water. There was support for continuing with the exemptions being provided to large families and those with medical needs.

In a number of instances submitters encouraged us to look at other ways of promoting water conservation, including the use of rainwater tanks and incentives for their uptake. Some submitters think that rainwater tanks should be mandatory for new subdivisions and developments.

Submitters over the age of 50 years were more likely to support increasing the daily residential allowance to 900 litres, while those under the age of 34 years were more likely to oppose raising the daily allowance.

Age	Support increasing daily allowance to 900 litres a day for residential properties		Do not support increasing daily allowance to 900 litres a day for residential properties	
	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated	11	79%	3	21%
Under 18 years	2	100%		
18 – 24 years	1	6%	16	94%
25 – 34 years	17	27%	45	73%
35 – 49 years	42	44%	54	56%
50 – 64 years	49	56%	39	44%
65 – 79 years	67	68%	31	32%
Over 80 years	2	50%	2	50%
<b>Total</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>50%</b>

Geographically, views were also mixed. Submitters who live in the Burwood, Halswell, Hornby, Papanui, Innes and Heathcote wards tended to be more supportive of increasing the daily allowance to 900 litres.

Submitters who live in the Linwood, Central, Waimairi, Spreydon and Cashmere wards tended to be more supportive of retaining the daily allowance at 700 litres.

Community Board	Support increasing daily allowance to 900 litres a day for residential properties		Do not support increasing daily allowance to 900 litres a day for residential properties	
	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters	Number of Submitters	% of Submitters
Not Stated*	48	45%	59	55%
Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula	3	50%	3	50%
Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood	22	58%	16	42%
Coastal	10	56%	8	44%
Burwood	10	83%	2	17%
Linwood	2	25%	6	75%
Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton	20	69%	9	31%
Halswell	13	76%	4	24%
Hornby	3	75%	1	25%
Riccarton	4	50%	4	50%
Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood	26	50%	26	50%

Fendalton	11	58%	8	42%
Waimairi	6	40%	9	60%
Harewood	9	50%	9	50%
<b>Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>50%</b>
Papanui	22	63%	13	37%
Innes	3	60%	2	40%
Central	2	14%	12	86%
<b>Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>53%</b>
Spreydon	6	30%	14	70%
Cashmere	9	29%	22	71%
Heathcote	30	68%	14	32%
<b>Total</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>50%</b>

Note: Numbers in table(s) based on responses to multiple choice questions.

## Our Proposed Spending (118 submitters)

Submitters provided a wide range of feedback on our proposed spending, including a significant number of alternative proposals (n=67). 13 submitters indicated their support for our proposed spending, 11 opposed and 32 provided general comments or feedback.

Alternative proposals ranged from requests that we spend more on specific projects or in specific areas, to calls for us to reduce our spending, particularly on perceived nice to haves and things that submitters did not deem to be core council services.

Requests for additional spending on services echoed the feedback that we received across other themes and categories, including investing more in our transport infrastructure (particularly public transport infrastructure, cycleways and footpaths), prioritising maintenance of our assets and infrastructure, and more investment in reducing emissions and the impacts of climate change.

Some submitters expressed a real concern about the future, and what that might look like for Christchurch if we don't prioritise spending on important issues.

On the other hand, a number of submitters expressed their frustration with our spending on perceived nice to haves and things that are not seen as critical or important. These submitters were often frustrated by the way we are designing infrastructure and the costs of building and maintaining it. Many of these submitters referenced spending on core services or the basics, however there was no clear consensus on what constitutes core services or the basics. In reality, these are likely to differ from resident to resident - one person's 'nice to have' is another person's core service.

Issues raised in the general comments and feedback were very similar to those in the alternative proposals, with a particular focus on prioritising investment in areas and activities that will support emissions reduction and reducing our climate impact.



Many submitters expressed concerns about staff matters, both the amount that the organisation spends on staff costs and on the other hand concerns about spending on consultants instead of building internal knowledge and capacity. Staff retention was also addressed by some submitters.

## Transport

Transport spending and issues were once again a priority for submitters this year. Generally, the nature of submissions received on transport has been changing over recent years.

This year we have seen the issues covered by submitters shift away from the maintenance and quality of our transport infrastructure, with instead a strong emphasis on prioritising investment in public transport infrastructure, footpaths, streetscapes, and cycleways, and the future of our transport network coming to the fore.

### Cycleways (288 submitters)

More than a third of submitters (35%) provided feedback on our proposed spending on cycling infrastructure or more general feedback on cycling infrastructure in Christchurch.

150 submitters indicated that they support our proposed spending on cycleways, 32 opposed, 92 provided alternative proposals and 35 provided general feedback or comments.

Most of the submitters who indicated their support for our proposed spending on cycleways were signalling their support for investment in active and public transport in general. Others expressed their support of continued investment in cycleways, with a view that we need to get on and complete the rest of the major cycleways network. The positive climate impacts of investment in cycleways were highlighted alongside the importance of improving safety for cyclists.

Those who opposed our proposed spending had mixed views. Some provided the feedback that we are spending too much on cycleways and that the money would be better spent elsewhere, while others indicated that they would like to see spending on cycleways prioritised and some projects brought forward and completed earlier.

Alternative proposals largely focused on the deferral of cycleways projects and increased funding for cycling infrastructure in general or infrastructure in specific areas of the city. There were several requests for additional cycling infrastructure in various parts of the city, with the east featuring prominently in these requests. There was a sense from many that the council needs to honour the promises it has made and deliver on the planned network.

The safety benefits of cycling infrastructure were regularly pointed out by submitters requesting that we spend more on cycling infrastructure, with many indicating that they still do not feel it is safe to cycle in Christchurch. There was a sense from many of these submitters that the best way to reduce our environmental impact is to provide safe, accessible transport alternatives that will encourage more people to consider how they are travelling.

### Wheels to Wings (304 submitters)

304 submitters provided feedback on the proposal to not begin construction on the Wheels to Wings cycleway for 12 months to give councillors and staff time to work closely with the community to address concerns about the cycleway's design.

236 opposed the proposal to not begin construction for 12 months, 27 supported the proposal, 17 provided alternative proposals and 29 made general comments about the project.

Feedback from those who opposed the proposal emphasized that the proposed cycleway has already undergone significant public consultation; there was a sense from some of these submitters that delaying it further would be pandering to ‘NIMBYism’ instead of doing the right thing by getting on with it and providing the promised infrastructure.

The importance of this cycleway as part of the wider network was regularly discussed by submitters, who also drew attention to the role that both this cycleway and the wider network will play in lowering carbon emissions, promoting active transport, and making the city safer for those who choose to travel by bike. Submitters pointed out the significance of the northwest as an employment node, and the need to provide safe infrastructure for those travelling to work in the area. Others highlighted the need to provide safe infrastructure for children travelling to school in the area.

There were concerns from some that delaying the start of construction would put the government funding in jeopardy.

Those who supported the proposal tended to be residents who live on Harewood Road or nearby. Their feedback tended to focus on concerns about the design of the proposed cycleway and the impacts that it would have on both residents and businesses in the area. In some instances, they indicated that they would like to see the project cancelled altogether. The impacts on travel at peak times was a concern for many, along with concerns about their ability to access their properties with ease. Others raised concerns that the proposed design or cycleways in general are over engineered, costly and should not be a priority when households are facing financial pressure.

Many of the submitters who were supportive of the 12-month pause or not proceeding at all indicated that they still want to see the traffic lights installed at Harewood/Breens/Gardiners intersection.

Those who provided alternatives tended to feel that the proposed cycleway should just be cancelled altogether or significantly altered or scaled back. There was a sense from a number of these submitters and those who supported the proposal that we have not listened to the community or considered their concerns in the proposed design.

General comments and feedback tended to address whether there really is a need for this level of cycling infrastructure, concerns about the cost, potential traffic disruption and safety concerns. In some instances, submitters noted that they feel the money would be better spent on other things, including road and footpath repairs and maintenance, or improving our public transport infrastructure.

On the other hand, submitters highlighted the benefits that a safe cycleway on Harewood Road would bring, particularly the improvements to cyclist safety and the environmental benefits of reducing emissions.

### **Footpaths and Streetscapes (214 submitters)**

A range of feedback was received on our proposed spending on footpaths and streetscapes. 144 submitters indicated that they support our proposed spending, 4 opposed, 52 put forward alternative proposals and 22 provided general comments or feedback.

Those who support our proposed spending tended to indicate that they are generally supportive of investment in infrastructure that provides for active and public transport. Many noted that they were pleased to see we are prioritising improving the quality of our footpaths, and there was strong support for the roving maintenance crew and the intent of this proposal.

Those who opposed our proposed spending tended to be concerned about the deferral of footpath maintenance and pedestrian improvement projects.

Alternative proposals included a range of other areas and projects that submitters would like prioritised, many of which are in the east of the city. Issues raised included the maintenance of roadside kerbs and berms, hazardous footpaths and intersections, the need for footpath upgrades, pedestrian crossings and seating, and reports of overflowing rubbish bins in public spaces. Others suggested that we should be reducing spending on perceived nice to haves to enable more investment into our footpaths and streetscapes.

General comments from submitters covered concerns about the deteriorating condition of footpaths and streetscapes. Overall, the comments were reflective of a desire for improved maintenance of our footpaths and streetscapes.

### **Public Transport Infrastructure (182 submitters)**

Investment in public transport infrastructure was a priority for many submitters this year. 136 submitters indicated that they support our proposed spending, 2 opposed, 35 provided alternatives and 15 made general comments or provided general feedback about our public transport infrastructure.

Those who supported our proposed spend largely just signalled their support for ongoing investment in public and active transport. The importance of transport choice was highlighted.

Alternative proposals largely focused on more investment in public transport infrastructure that will make it easier and quicker to travel by public transport. Submitters acknowledged the need to reduce emissions, and the role that public transport has to play in providing alternative travel options.

### **Roads (126 submitters)**

The level of feedback provided on our proposed spending on roads was significantly lower than we have seen in previous years. 126 submitters provided feedback; 11 supported our proposed spending, 8 opposed, 80 provided alternatives and 36 submitters provided general comments or feedback.

Alternatives provided by submitters included the familiar messages of to reduce the number of patch jobs being done and instead focus on fixing things properly, and a greater focus on improving the condition of infrastructure in the east.

Submitters raised a number of specific roads and intersections that they feel need attention. Many of the requests related to safety improvements.

It was common for submitters to indicate that they do not feel we are putting enough focus on the basics or core services, and as a result the quality of our infrastructure is suffering.

### **Other Transport Issues (160 Submitters)**

A number of other transport issues were addressed by submitters, including emissions reduction, the inner-city shuttle, the availability of rubbish bins and the emptying of bins in public spaces, the roving footpath crew and the future of our transport network.

A significant number of these submitters (n=130) provided their support for our proposed spending, particularly the roving footpath maintenance crew noting their support for improving the safety and accessibility of our footpaths. One submitter noted that while they were supportive, they felt that it was just a scratch on the surface of the issue.

Several alternative proposals were put forward by submitters, including investigating the use of light rail for public transport, prioritising getting the inner-city shuttle reinstated, and proposals to address a range of safety concerns.

Submitters requested that we bring forward work in the east, noting inequities in the condition of transport infrastructure across the city.

In some instances, submitters encouraged us to look critically at our proposed transport spending and consider how we could make travel in Christchurch more sustainable.

## Stormwater & Land Drainage (48 submitters)

Stormwater and land drainage issues were a focus for those submitters who are currently dealing with ongoing challenges with surface flooding. Of the 48 submitters who addressed the topic, 7 supported our proposed spending, 8 opposed and 31 provided alternatives.

Alternatives proposed by submitters included requests for investment in specific parts of the city, focusing on their own needs and priorities as opposed to spending across the wider network. Specific areas where submitters are looking for more investment included New Brighton, Woolston, Brooklands and Spencerville, Brenchley Avenue, Tenby Place and the Dudley Culvert.

In some instances, submitters addressed the need for proactive investment in coastal areas in the interests of climate resilience and flood protection.

Many of the submitters who addressed stormwater and land drainage were frustrated with the ongoing challenges they face as a result of surface flooding and called for more investment to help protect and preserve their quality of life.

In other instances, submitters called for more proactive maintenance (particularly regular clearing of drains) to help reduce the amount of surface flooding seen during heavy rain events.

## Other/Special Interest Topics

### Climate Change (73 Submitters)

Concerns about our changing climate and the things we can do to address this featured prominently throughout submissions this year, as reflected throughout this analysis. 73 submitters directly addressed our investment in climate change and climate issues.

Submitters provided strong support for climate initiatives in the draft plan, however many felt that they did not go far enough.

50 of these submitters provided alternative proposals that stressed the need for additional funding for strategies, programmes and projects that are going to contribute to building climate resilience and reducing emissions. Some submitters called for more investment in biodiversity and ecological restoration, acknowledging the positive impacts this would have for climate resilience. Others indicated that they would like to see us do more to encourage green infrastructure and eco-friendly buildings and businesses.

Submitters pointed out that we have an obligation to support, protect and provide for both our current and future residents and communities.

### **Disposal of Council Owned Land (261 Submitters)**

Submitters provided mixed views on the proposed disposal of council owned land. 261 submitters provided feedback; 64 supported the proposed disposal of the land, 12 opposed and 166 submitters provided alternative proposals. 21 provided general comments and feedback.

Those who supported the disposal of the proposed land believed if they had been deemed as surplus to requirement, they should be sold to help reduce rates, borrowing and debt. There was a desire from many that they are sold in a competitive market to achieve the highest possible price.

The alternative proposals covered a range of suggestions, including leasing some properties instead of selling them, finding alternative uses such as social housing or public amenities, using the land to plant more trees or turning some parcels into parks or community spaces. Others expressed concerns about the future use of red zoned land, or a desire to see it offered back to those who owned it prior to it being red zoned.

Submitters commonly indicated that they thought some of the properties should be used to provide housing, with suggestions including selling to private developers or donating the land to social housing providers.

The proposed sale of land in Diamond Harbour was a particular focus, with the community stressing that they have a strong desire to work in partnership with us to see the land become a permanent reserve. Many submitters highlighted that it is already used in this way by the community, and the community are prepared to do their bit to help care for and maintain it.

In a number of instances, the proposals put forward highlighted a desire for a partnership approach to the future of these properties, with many communities and organisations proposing alternative uses for them.

Several submitters highlighted the importance of involving the community further in the decision making around the future of these properties.

### **Canoe Polo Courts (54 Submitters)**

Several submissions were received in support of funding for two additional canoe polo courts at Lake Roto Kohatu, to support the growing sport.

The challenges of operating and supporting a sport that continues to grow in popularity with the facilities currently available was highlighted by a number of submitters. There was a sense that we support many other sports and organisations with the facilities that they need, and now it is their turn to see some investment in their sport. As the sport continues to grow, the demand on the facilities will continue to grow too.

Submitters highlighted the potential benefits for the city of having the appropriate facilities to host national tournaments.

### **South Library (81 submitters)**

Submissions received on the South Library drew attention to the importance of this community facility for those who live in the south of Christchurch. Submitters expressed strong opposition to any reductions to the budget or scope of the project, emphasizing the need for a fit for purpose facility that acts not only as a library but also as a community hub.

Submitters had varying opinions on whether the facility should be rebuilt or strengthened and repaired, but regardless of their opinion on the right approach, they were unanimous and unwavering in their message around the importance of the project delivering a facility that is fit for purpose and will meet the needs of the community.

Several submitters also addressed the infrastructure needed to support the facility, particularly a range of safe ways to get there. Safe speed zones and completing the major cycleways and the required links and connections featured prominently in these submissions.